

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Aberdeen	Sac & Fox	1,297	39%	\$21,276	\$17,345	\$0	\$38,621	\$30
Aberdeen	Winnebago	4,366	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Aberdeen	Omaha	3,656	65%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Aberdeen	Santee	802	77%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Aberdeen	Northern Ponca	2,063	47%	\$0	\$17,127	\$0	\$17,127	\$8
Aberdeen	Turtle Mountain	13,837	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Aberdeen	Standing Rock (SR)	5,182	50%	\$0	\$32,581	\$0	\$32,581	\$6
Aberdeen	McLaughlin	4,080	48%	\$0	\$31,286	\$0	\$31,286	\$8
Aberdeen	Spirit Lake (Ft. Totten)	5,407	46%	\$0	\$46,473	\$0	\$46,473	\$9
Aberdeen	Three Affiliated (Ft. Berthold)	5,981	47%	\$0	\$46,595	\$0	\$46,595	\$8
Aberdeen	Trenton	1,659	49%	\$0	\$12,641	\$0	\$12,641	\$8
Aberdeen	Rapid City	11,036	48%	\$0	\$74,625	\$0	\$74,625	\$7
Aberdeen	Cheyenne River	8,424	49%	\$0	\$56,475	\$0	\$56,475	\$7
Aberdeen	Pine Ridge	22,828	60%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Aberdeen	Rosebud	12,261	57%	\$0	\$21,612	\$0	\$21,612	\$2
Aberdeen	Sisseton-Wahpeton	5,834	57%	\$0	\$10,025	\$0	\$10,025	\$2
Aberdeen	Yankton	4,088	56%	\$0	\$8,908	\$0	\$8,908	\$2
Aberdeen	Flandreau	1,592	48%	\$0	\$12,921	\$0	\$12,921	\$8
Aberdeen	Crow Creek	3,715	55%	\$0	\$11,773	\$0	\$11,773	\$3
Aberdeen	Lower Brule	1,786	59%	\$0	\$1,002	\$0	\$1,002	\$1
Aberdeen Total		119,895		\$21,276	\$401,391	\$0	\$422,667	\$4
Alaska	Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association	991	95%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Arctic Slope Regional Tribe	4,416	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Bristol Bay Area Health	5,449	91%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Chugachmiut Tribe	2,602	40%	\$7,875	\$47,080	\$0	\$54,955	\$21
Alaska	Copper River Native Association	574	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Eastern Aleutian Tribe	784	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Kenaitze Indian Tribe	2,048	41%	\$0	\$29,939	\$0	\$29,939	\$15
Alaska	Ketchikan Indian Corporation	2,816	49%	\$0	\$28,555	\$0	\$28,555	\$10
Alaska	Kodiak	2,438	55%	\$0	\$10,846	\$0	\$10,846	\$4
Alaska	Maniilaq	7,288	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Alaska	Metlakatla Indian Tribe	1,334	53%	\$0	\$9,565	\$0	\$9,565	\$7
Alaska	Misc. Anchorage Tribes	353	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Ninilchik	326	51%	\$0	\$3,124	\$0	\$3,124	\$10
Alaska	Norton Sound	8,916	49%	\$0	\$78,164	\$0	\$78,164	\$9
Alaska	Seldovia	408	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Southcentral Foundation	35,542	77%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Southeast Alaska Regional	12,120	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Alaska	Tanana Chiefs Conference	14,273	46%	\$0	\$164,921	\$0	\$164,921	\$12
Alaska	Yukon Kuskokwim	23,393	44%	\$0	\$281,144	\$0	\$281,144	\$12
Alaska Total		126,070		\$7,875	\$653,340	\$0	\$661,214	\$5
Albuquerque	Albuquerque	33,591	41%	\$0	\$280,192	\$0	\$280,192	\$8
Albuquerque	Acoma-Canoncito-Laguna	11,488	48%	\$0	\$61,008	\$0	\$61,008	\$5
Albuquerque	Mescalero	4,486	60%	\$0	\$558	\$0	\$558	\$0
Albuquerque	Santa Fe	15,188	55%	\$0	\$33,433	\$0	\$33,433	\$2
Albuquerque	Zuni	8,095	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Albuquerque	Ramah	2,822	40%	\$15,510	\$30,903	\$0	\$46,413	\$16
Albuquerque	So Colorado Ute	5,464	54%	\$0	\$15,671	\$0	\$15,671	\$3
Albuquerque	Taos	2,297	51%	\$0	\$11,868	\$0	\$11,868	\$5
Albuquerque	Ysleta Del Sur	872	99%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Albuquerque	Jicarilla	3,194	57%	\$0	\$5,364	\$0	\$5,364	\$2
Albuquerque Total		87,496		\$15,510	\$438,995	\$0	\$454,504	\$5
Bemidji	Bad River	2,002	40%	\$0	\$23,261	\$0	\$23,261	\$12
Bemidji	Bay Mills	1,134	43%	\$0	\$12,443	\$0	\$12,443	\$11
Bemidji	Bois Forte/Nett Lake (T-V)	1,280	53%	\$0	\$5,362	\$0	\$5,362	\$4
Bemidji	Fond Du Lac (T-V)	6,039	39%	\$58,225	\$66,634	\$0	\$124,860	\$21
Bemidji	Forest County	1,101	28%	\$219,233	\$13,900	\$0	\$233,133	\$212
Bemidji	Grand Portage	514	41%	\$0	\$6,002	\$0	\$6,002	\$12
Bemidji	Grand Traverse (T-V)	1,781	55%	\$0	\$4,951	\$0	\$4,951	\$3
Bemidji	Greater Leech Lake	10,319	42%	\$0	\$96,633	\$0	\$96,633	\$9
Bemidji	Greater Red Lake	7,876	60%	\$0	\$480	\$0	\$480	\$0
Bemidji	Greater White Earth	8,319	46%	\$0	\$62,984	\$0	\$62,984	\$8

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Bemidji	Gun Lake	276	48%	\$0	\$2,067	\$0	\$2,067	\$7
Bemidji	Hannahville	1,034	38%	\$36,611	\$12,933	\$0	\$49,544	\$48
Bemidji	Ho-Chunk	4,617	40%	\$536	\$52,564	\$0	\$53,101	\$12
Bemidji	Huron Potawatomi	612	44%	\$0	\$6,292	\$0	\$6,292	\$10
Bemidji	Keweenaw Bay (T-V)	1,756	44%	\$0	\$17,437	\$0	\$17,437	\$10
Bemidji	Lac Courte Oreilles	3,783	43%	\$0	\$37,085	\$0	\$37,085	\$10
Bemidji	Lac Du Flambeau	2,910	44%	\$0	\$27,814	\$0	\$27,814	\$10
Bemidji	Lac Vieux Desert	423	71%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bemidji	Little River Ottawa	950	42%	\$0	\$10,698	\$0	\$10,698	\$11
Bemidji	Little Traverse Odawa	2,534	42%	\$0	\$24,903	\$0	\$24,903	\$10
Bemidji	Lower Sioux	724	31%	\$111,112	\$9,233	\$0	\$120,345	\$166
Bemidji	Menominee	7,175	40%	\$36,632	\$77,503	\$0	\$114,135	\$16
Bemidji	Mille Lacs (T-V)	2,377	42%	\$0	\$27,196	\$0	\$27,196	\$11
Bemidji	Oneida (T-V)	8,302	42%	\$0	\$79,557	\$0	\$79,557	\$10
Bemidji	Pokagon Potawatomi	2,391	41%	\$0	\$29,618	\$0	\$29,618	\$12
Bemidji	Prairie Island	385	47%	\$0	\$3,120	\$0	\$3,120	\$8
Bemidji	Red Cliff	1,652	49%	\$0	\$11,087	\$0	\$11,087	\$7
Bemidji	Saginaw Chippewa	2,722	33%	\$299,419	\$33,144	\$0	\$332,563	\$122
Bemidji	Saulte Sainte Marie (T-V)	9,671	41%	\$0	\$92,438	\$0	\$92,438	\$10
Bemidji	Shakopee	578	31%	\$90,259	\$7,999	\$0	\$98,259	\$170
Bemidji	Sokaogon	373	55%	\$0	\$1,105	\$0	\$1,105	\$3
Bemidji	St Croix	1,734	38%	\$64,045	\$21,483	\$0	\$85,528	\$49
Bemidji	Stockbridge-Munsee	1,520	50%	\$0	\$9,387	\$0	\$9,387	\$6
Bemidji	Upper Sioux	357	47%	\$0	\$2,799	\$0	\$2,799	\$8
Bemidji Total		99,222		\$916,073	\$890,113	\$0	\$1,806,185	\$18
Billings	Blackfeet	12,197	62%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings	Crow	12,580	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings	Ft Belknap	4,938	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings	Ft Peck	8,892	62%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings	No. Cheyenne	6,684	79%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings	Wind River	10,437	53%	\$0	\$37,868	\$0	\$37,868	\$4

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Billings	Flathead	10,537	55%	\$0	\$28,614	\$0	\$28,614	\$3
Billings	Rocky Boy	4,707	69%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Billings Total		70,973		\$0	\$66,482	\$0	\$66,482	\$1
California	Cabazon	3	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Central Valley	5,904	44%	\$0	\$44,287	\$0	\$44,287	\$8
California	Chapa De	3,814	47%	\$0	\$26,407	\$0	\$26,407	\$7
California	Colusa	111	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Consolidated	2,138	49%	\$0	\$12,970	\$0	\$12,970	\$6
California	Feather River	3,343	46%	\$0	\$23,610	\$0	\$23,610	\$7
California	Greenville	1,181	44%	\$0	\$10,309	\$0	\$10,309	\$9
California	Hoopa	3,214	59%	\$0	\$1,171	\$0	\$1,171	\$0
California	Indian Health Council	4,611	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Karuk	1,872	59%	\$0	\$1,367	\$0	\$1,367	\$1
California	Lake County	1,618	45%	\$0	\$13,167	\$0	\$13,167	\$8
California	Modoc	215	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Northern Valley	1,666	47%	\$0	\$11,538	\$0	\$11,538	\$7
California	Pit River	866	73%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Quartz Valley	137	56%	\$0	\$256	\$0	\$256	\$2
California	Redding Rancheria	4,035	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Riverside/San Bernardino	11,932	62%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Round Valley	1,146	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Santa Ynez	738	42%	\$0	\$7,855	\$0	\$7,855	\$11
California	Southern Indian Health Council	2,504	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Susanville	965	54%	\$0	\$3,310	\$0	\$3,310	\$3
California	Sycuan	82	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Table Mountain	11	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Toiyabe	2,810	53%	\$0	\$9,926	\$0	\$9,926	\$4
California	Tule River	2,563	58%	\$0	\$2,145	\$0	\$2,145	\$1
California	CHRIE - Shingle Springs	866	45%	\$0	\$7,651	\$0	\$7,651	\$9
California	CHRIE - Sonoma County	4,028	53%	\$0	\$14,595	\$0	\$14,595	\$4
California	CHRIE - MACT	2,160	55%	\$0	\$5,451	\$0	\$5,451	\$3

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
California	CHTRIB - United Indian Health Ser	6,556	50%	\$0	\$29,774	\$0	\$29,774	\$5
California	CHTRIB - Warner Mountain	127	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Cold Springs Tribal Council	160	35%	\$11,443	\$1,773	\$0	\$13,216	\$83
California	Coyote Valley Tribal Council	123	64%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Hopland Band of Pomo Indians	250	36%	\$14,686	\$2,770	\$0	\$17,457	\$70
California	Lytton Rancheria	116	36%	\$6,440	\$1,285	\$0	\$7,725	\$67
California	Scotts Valley Band of Pomo India	43	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo I	249	36%	\$12,898	\$2,759	\$0	\$15,657	\$63
California	Pinoleville Band of Pomo Indians	99	35%	\$6,857	\$1,097	\$0	\$7,954	\$80
California	Guidiville Indian Rancheria	61	92%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
California	Graton	307	33%	\$32,298	\$3,596	\$0	\$35,894	\$117
California	Mewok	183	35%	\$13,235	\$2,028	\$0	\$15,263	\$83
California Total		72,808		\$97,858	\$241,099	\$0	\$338,956	\$5
Nashville	Alabama Coushatta	945	54%	\$0	\$2,810	\$0	\$2,810	\$3
Nashville	Catawba	1,734	38%	\$49,806	\$17,854	\$0	\$67,660	\$39
Nashville	Cayuga	156	53%	\$0	\$625	\$0	\$625	\$4
Nashville	Cherokee	10,275	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Chitimacha	471	83%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Choctaw	8,944	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Coushatta of Louisiana	569	44%	\$0	\$4,883	\$0	\$4,883	\$9
Nashville	Creek	1,946	69%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Maliseet	409	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Miccosukee	637	99%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Narragansett	720	84%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Oneida	1,797	55%	\$0	\$5,586	\$0	\$5,586	\$3
Nashville	Onondaga SU	91	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Jena Band	134	81%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Passamaquoddy of Indian Towns	743	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Passamaquoddy of Pleasant Poi	950	91%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Penobscot	1,320	78%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Pequot	974	49%	\$0	\$6,459	\$0	\$6,459	\$7

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Nashville	Seminole	3,907	64%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Seneca	6,028	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	St Regis	4,258	57%	\$0	\$5,614	\$0	\$5,614	\$1
Nashville	Tunica Biloxi	301	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	Mohegan	922	45%	\$0	\$8,494	\$0	\$8,494	\$9
Nashville	Wampanoag	291	87%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville	MicMac	520	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nashville Total		49,042		\$49,806	\$52,324	\$0	\$102,129	\$2
Navajo	Chinle	16,179	62%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Tsaile	7,893	46%	\$0	\$55,546	\$0	\$55,546	\$7
Navajo	Pinon (new facility underway)	8,744	41%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Crownpoint	20,029	50%	\$0	\$89,655	\$0	\$89,655	\$4
Navajo	Fort Defiance	18,173	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Ganado	13,092	45%	\$0	\$89,269	\$0	\$89,269	\$7
Navajo	Gallup	33,324	65%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Tohatchi	7,702	48%	\$0	\$44,559	\$0	\$44,559	\$6
Navajo	Kayenta	13,306	42%	\$0	\$108,231	\$0	\$108,231	\$8
Navajo	Inscription House	3,368	42%	\$0	\$34,321	\$0	\$34,321	\$10
Navajo	Shiprock	40,121	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Dzilth Na O Dith Hle	5,680	46%	\$0	\$39,912	\$0	\$39,912	\$7
Navajo	Utah Navajo (Tribal)	7,448	32%	\$634,037	\$62,902	\$0	\$696,939	\$94
Navajo	Tuba City (Tribal)	26,788	65%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Navajo	Winslow (Tribal)	4,939	51%	\$0	\$21,771	\$0	\$21,771	\$4
Navajo	Dilkon (Tribal)	6,243	41%	\$0	\$60,071	\$0	\$60,071	\$10
Navajo	Leupp (Tribal)	3,800	38%	\$90,548	\$40,566	\$0	\$131,114	\$35
Navajo Total		236,829		\$724,585	\$646,804	\$0	\$1,371,389	\$6
Oklahoma	Claremore	39,753	44%	\$0	\$256,722	\$0	\$256,722	\$6
Oklahoma	Clinton	9,621	51%	\$0	\$36,266	\$0	\$36,266	\$4
Oklahoma	Haskell	3,893	41%	\$0	\$36,640	\$0	\$36,640	\$9
Oklahoma	Lawton	23,637	53%	\$0	\$63,718	\$0	\$63,718	\$3
Oklahoma	Pawnee	9,308	70%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Oklahoma	Tahlequah	17,004	45%	\$0	\$102,481	\$0	\$102,481	\$6
Oklahoma	Wewoka	9,459	27%	\$1,383,288	\$86,198	\$0	\$1,469,486	\$155
Oklahoma	Abs Shawnee	8,533	28%	\$1,156,626	\$78,167	\$0	\$1,234,794	\$145
Oklahoma	Chickasaw	31,403	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oklahoma	Cherokee	60,917	48%	\$0	\$306,666	\$0	\$306,666	\$5
Oklahoma	Choctaw	33,890	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oklahoma	Creek	23,028	53%	\$0	\$62,741	\$0	\$62,741	\$3
Oklahoma	Kaw	1,317	46%	\$0	\$9,298	\$0	\$9,298	\$7
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Kansas	789	46%	\$0	\$5,666	\$0	\$5,666	\$7
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Texas	32	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oklahoma	Ponca Tribe Of Oklahoma	3,743	50%	\$0	\$19,332	\$0	\$19,332	\$5
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Oklahoma	5,879	41%	\$0	\$54,861	\$0	\$54,861	\$9
Oklahoma	Citizen Potawatomi	10,831	40%	\$0	\$92,826	\$0	\$92,826	\$9
Oklahoma	Iowa Of Oklahoma	936	48%	\$0	\$6,384	\$0	\$6,384	\$7
Oklahoma	Sac And Fox Of Oklahoma	6,211	39%	\$38,177	\$58,467	\$0	\$96,644	\$16
Oklahoma	Wyandotte / E Shawnee	1,327	41%	\$0	\$13,224	\$0	\$13,224	\$10
Oklahoma	Miami Consortium	8,696	29%	\$1,097,861	\$77,464	\$0	\$1,175,324	\$135
Oklahoma	Delaware of Eastern OK	0	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oklahoma	Prairie Band Pottawatomi / Sac	1,460	45%	\$0	\$11,767	\$0	\$11,767	\$8
Oklahoma	Iowa - KS NE	376	81%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Oklahoma Total		312,044		\$3,675,952	\$1,378,888	\$0	\$5,054,840	\$16
Phoenix	Phoenix SU	58,832	48%	\$0	\$290,131	\$0	\$290,131	\$5
Phoenix	Keams Canyon/Hopi	6,100	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	U&O	4,004	65%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Whiteriver	14,938	57%	\$0	\$20,973	\$0	\$20,973	\$1
Phoenix	Ft. Yuma	3,698	60%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Colorado River	5,334	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Peach Springs/Supai	2,509	83%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	San Carlos	11,525	48%	\$0	\$67,545	\$0	\$67,545	\$6
Phoenix	Elko	2,093	65%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Duckwater	140	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Phoenix	Ely	296	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Gila River	20,467	54%	\$0	\$54,273	\$0	\$54,273	\$3
Phoenix	PITU	828	84%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Owyhee	1,272	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Schurz/Walker River	888	88%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Fallon/Lovelock/Yomba	1,669	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix	Pyramid Lake	1,647	59%	\$0	\$1,082	\$0	\$1,082	\$1
Phoenix	Reno-Sparks/Nevada Urban	3,772	52%	\$0	\$16,636	\$0	\$16,636	\$4
Phoenix	Las Vegas/Moapa	1,647	46%	\$0	\$14,051	\$0	\$14,051	\$9
Phoenix	Ft. McDermitt	672	52%	\$0	\$3,356	\$0	\$3,356	\$5
Phoenix	Washoe	2,341	57%	\$0	\$4,677	\$0	\$4,677	\$2
Phoenix	Yerington	640	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phoenix Total		145,314		\$0	\$472,723	\$0	\$472,723	\$3
Portland	Burns Paiute	243	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Chehalis	1,005	45%	\$0	\$8,920	\$0	\$8,920	\$9
Portland	Coeur d'Alene	4,116	50%	\$0	\$21,552	\$0	\$21,552	\$5
Portland	Colville	8,626	53%	\$0	\$27,653	\$0	\$27,653	\$3
Portland	Coos, L Umpqua, Suislaw	712	79%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Coquille	873	76%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Cow Creek	1,956	39%	\$19,806	\$21,404	\$0	\$41,210	\$21
Portland	Cowlitz	687	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Grand Ronde	2,716	79%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Hoh	61	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Jamestown S'Klallam	456	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Kalispel	324	56%	\$0	\$811	\$0	\$811	\$3
Portland	Klamath	2,815	58%	\$0	\$2,421	\$0	\$2,421	\$1
Portland	Kootenai	206	87%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Lower Elwha	822	58%	\$0	\$1,002	\$0	\$1,002	\$1
Portland	Lummi	4,518	59%	\$0	\$2,601	\$0	\$2,601	\$1
Portland	Makah	1,961	51%	\$0	\$9,907	\$0	\$9,907	\$5
Portland	Muckleshoot	3,272	40%	\$18,115	\$34,931	\$0	\$53,046	\$16

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: \$5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Portland	Nez Perce	3,779	69%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Nisqually	1,170	49%	\$0	\$7,755	\$0	\$7,755	\$7
Portland	Nooksack	976	50%	\$0	\$5,770	\$0	\$5,770	\$6
Portland	Nw Band Of Shoshoni	50	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Port Gamble	1,376	45%	\$0	\$11,769	\$0	\$11,769	\$9
Portland	Puyallup	8,227	59%	\$0	\$3,720	\$0	\$3,720	\$0
Portland	Quileute	610	56%	\$0	\$1,551	\$0	\$1,551	\$3
Portland	Quinalt	2,592	70%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Samish	386	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Sauk-Suiattle	164	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Shoalwater Bay	432	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Shoshone-Bannock	5,938	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Siletz	5,221	50%	\$0	\$24,153	\$0	\$24,153	\$5
Portland	Skokomish	892	58%	\$0	\$897	\$0	\$897	\$1
Portland	Snoqualmie	169	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Spokane	1,793	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Squaxin Island	612	94%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Stillaguamish	111	100% or more	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Suquamish	470	98%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Swinomish	1,015	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Tulalip	4,023	43%	\$0	\$34,881	\$0	\$34,881	\$9
Portland	Umatilla	2,798	74%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Upper Skagit	527	46%	\$0	\$4,278	\$0	\$4,278	\$8
Portland	Warm Springs	5,581	82%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Portland	Western Oregon (Chemawa)	2,838	49%	\$0	\$16,768	\$0	\$16,768	\$6
Portland	Yakama	12,243	56%	\$0	\$20,786	\$0	\$20,786	\$2
Portland Total		99,361		\$37,921	\$263,528	\$0	\$301,449	\$3
Tucson	Tohono O'Odham	18,257	55%	\$0	\$41,170	\$0	\$41,170	\$2
Tucson	Yaqui	5,752	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Tucson Total		24,009		\$0	\$41,170	\$0	\$41,170	\$2

Report #2: FY 2005 IHCIF - \$11,093,710 Allocated by the Same 2 Tier Formula Adopted in 2003								
Tier 1: \$5,546,855 for units scoring < 40%; Tier 2: %5,546,855 for units scoring 40% - 60%. Tier 3: 0\$ for units scoring > 60%								
AREA	OPERATING UNIT	FY 04 Users	FY 2004 LNF % Score	FY 2005 TIER 1 <40%	FY 2005 TIER 2 40%-60%	FY 2005 TIER 3 60%-100%	FY 2005 Allocation	Allocation Per User
Grand Total		1,443,062		\$5,546,855	\$5,546,855	\$0	\$11,093,710	\$8